

Some initial thoughts on the phone survey – Edward

Draft 11/28/06

**First half of survey:**

Little over 50% of the sample have visited an OK river or lake in the last year and most of the uses were water-based.

Ninety percent of the sample have at least some awareness of the IR and TK.

75% of the sample think that there are some scenic rivers or lakes in the State. IR and TK are most mentioned, but a lot of others sites are mentioned as well.

When those people with awareness of the sites were asked their impressions of the sites (good or bad), few mention pollution – most mention good things: 9% mention pollution or chicken waste for the IR, 3% for TK.

19% of the sample have heard of water-quality concerns at the IR and TK, but most of these don't seem to share these concerns, or hold them at the forefront – water-quality concerns were rarely mentioned when impressions were solicited.

We need to distinguish between individuals being concerned and individuals having heard that others are concerned.<sup>1</sup>

Of the 19% who are aware of water-quality concerns at the sites, most think chickens. In summary, of those people who know of water quality concerns, few blame it on non-poultry sources.

If estimated damages are to be significant, people will have to be educated about the injuries. There is currently not a lot of knowledge of the injuries.

**Media part of survey:**

Approximately 50% of the sample have seen or heard ads about the “poultry industry”. I wonder how much if anything those who have seen or heard the ads relate them to the IR or TK. Was the IR or TK mentioned in the ads? Interestingly, only half? of those who had seen ads mentioned chickens or poultry when asked about what was in the ads.

Only 25% have seen news reports or editorials about the poultry industry, so more awareness of ads than of news reports and editorials.

(Colleen – I don't know how to access the responses to questions 27, 28, 31 and 34)

---

<sup>1</sup> Interestingly, we asked whether they had heard of concerns rather than whether they were concerned.

I don't know how to interpret "Did you believe what was in the ads?" given the varying responses to what was in the ads. Approximately 50% said they did (20% said they did not).

Too few people were asked whether poultry farmers takes adequate care.

### **Response rates and other stuff:**

Are our response rates typical? And, what sorts of inferences can be made about OK residents on the basis of these response rates?

Colleen should check to see how the sample relates to the population in terms of age, income, education, (rural, city, suburb), etc. Are there any clear indications that the sample is not representative of the population? For example, is the proportion of Native Americans in the sample consistent with the proportion in the population? The proportion of Blacks?

If we do this again, should the survey be significantly shorter? Do we have any indication that shortening it would increase response rates?

### **What are Roger's impressions?**

### **Specific questions and comments for Colleen and Rich:**

1. Look at the list of scenic rivers and lakes and see if you can figure out how many different people mentioned either the IR or TK. I want to get a sense of what proportion of the state thinks one or both of these sites are scenic.
2. Your description of who answered question 15 seems strange. Do you mean those that "have heard", rather than those that "have not heard"?
3. In finaldata\_kch, I don't know how to read the results for questions 27 and 28, 31, 34, etc. Are they there?
4. I would like to see how the responses to "what was in the ads" and "did you believe the ads" correlates with other responses. For example, how do the answers to these questions correlate with those who were aware of water quality concerns (Q19 and Q22), or those who mentioned pollution or poultry when asked what their impressions of the IR and TK (Q16 and Q17)
5. If we ask Questions 32 and 33 again, need to ask it of everyone who has seen ads or news reports, not just those who have new reports. Many people who had seen ads were not asked this question. In fact, these questions could be asked of almost everyone, not just those who have seen ads or new reports.
6. If we ask again whether they believed what was in the ads, we need relate it to what they saw in the ads. As in first ask what message was in the ads, and then

ask them if they believe that message. That way we can relate believe to what they believe.